

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the case. Claims 1-4, 8, 10-12, and 16-20 are amended herein. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-8 and 10-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Markus et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,490,601, hereafter referred to as Markus, in view of Daswani et al., hereafter referred to as Daswani. Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-8 and 10-14 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Markus in view of Daswani for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to amended independent Claim 1, which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to (emphasis added):

A method for providing transaction processing in a handheld computer, comprising:  
using a file server to process wireless queries and interface between said handheld computer system and the Internet wherein the handheld computer accesses Internet resources using said file server as an intermediary without directly connecting to the Internet;

storing a personal information database, on the file server, that contains personal information data relating to a user of the handheld computer;

storing a site map database, on the file server, that contains data which maps fields of the personal information database to frames of known Web clippings;

receiving a wireless request from a handheld computer to populate frames of a selected Web clipping;

retrieving personal information data from the personal information database for fields mapped to the frame in the selected Web clipping in the site map database; and

populating said selected web clipping with the retrieved personal information without said handheld computer system downloading said selected web clipping.

Independent Claim 10 recites similar limitations. Claims 2-8 that depend from independent Claim 1, and Claims 11-14 that depend on independent Claim 10 provide further recitations of the features of the embodiments of the present invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of "without directly connecting to the Internet" and "populating said selected web clipping with the retrieved personal information without said handheld computer system downloading said selected web clipping." The handheld computer system of the present invention is not directly connected to the Internet and does not download the selected web clipping. The selected web clipping is "known," as claimed and therefore is already resident on the handheld computer system. The concept of known web clippings is not taught or suggested by Markus or Daswani. For this reason, Markus and Daswani depend on downloading the selected form before

filling it in which is clearly different from the claimed invention that uses a file server to fill in the form without the handheld computer system actually downloading the form.

Markus and the claimed invention are very different. Applicant understands Markus to teach a server system for automatically inserting data into electronic forms (Abstract). Markus teaches away from the embodiments of the present invention by teaching an end user computer that is a stand-alone computer with access to the Internet and contains an Internet browser program and a browser window (col. 7 lines 29-33). In addition, Markus teaches the process of automatic form completion beginning with a user downloading the form from a web site (Col. 7 lines 41-42).

In contrast, embodiments of the claimed invention are directed towards a method for providing transaction processing in a handheld computer that is not directly connected to the Internet. Further, the claimed limitations of the present invention access forms from a file server for processing wireless queries and for interfacing between a handheld computer system and the Internet wherein the handheld computer accesses Internet resources using said file server as an intermediary without directly connecting to the Internet, as claimed.

The claimed limitations of the present invention are particularly useful for a handheld computer system because it limits the amount of information that needs to be sent/received to/from the handheld device. Furthermore, saving personal information on a remote file server adds a layer of security if the handheld device is lost or stolen. These benefits of the present invention are not appreciated by Markus because Markus fails to teach a handheld computer system.

The claimed limitations of the present invention specify a file server that interfaces the handheld computer with the Internet and populates the selected known form without the end computer system downloading the known form from the Internet. Markus actually teaches away from the claimed limitations of the present invention by teaching an end user computer with an Internet connection and Internet browser to download forms from the Internet (Column 7 lines 27-33). The handheld computer of the present invention may not comprise resources sufficient to download form from the Internet. Instead, the claimed limitations of the present invention utilize a file server to interface the handheld computer with the Internet without the handheld computer having a direct connection to the Internet and to populate web clippings without the end computer system downloading the web clipping, as claimed. The end computer system is not directly connected to the Internet and does not download form from the Internet, as taught by Markus.

The cited combination fails to teach or suggest the claimed embodiments because Daswani fails to remedy the deficiencies of Markus. Daswani may purport to teach a system comprising a wireless network coupled to the Internet by a data center. However, Daswani fails to teach or suggest “populating said selected web clipping with the retrieved personal information without said handheld computer system downloading said selected web clipping,” as claimed.

In fact, Daswani, like Markus, teaches downloading the form on the client device. Specifically, in column 3 lines 56-60, Daswani teaches “data forms for transformation to transmit to client devices.” Daswani teaches away from the claimed embodiment by transforming the data form and transmitting the data form to the client device which is very different from “populating said selected web clipping with the retrieved personal information without said handheld computer system downloading said selected web clipping,” as claimed. Daswani teaches capability of reconstructing data in an intelligent way (column 8 lines 30-32). The present invention does not reconstruct data. In contrast, the present invention uses a file server to populate known forms without requiring the client device to download the form.

Again, the claimed limitations of the present invention are particularly useful for a handheld computer system because it limits the amount of information that needs to be sent/received to/from the handheld device.

Furthermore, saving personal information on a remote file server adds a layer of security if the handheld device is lost or stolen. These benefits of the present invention are not appreciated by Daswani because Daswani fails to teach a handheld computer system.

Applicant respectfully asserts that nowhere does Markus alone or in combination with Daswani teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1 and 10, and that these Claims are thus in a condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Markus alone, or in combination with Daswani also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 2-8 which depend from independent Claim 1 and Claims 11-14 which depend from independent Claim 10. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-8 and 10-14 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in a condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 9 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Markus in view of Rai U.S. Patent No. 6,421,714, hereafter referred to as Rai, further in view of Daswani. Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present

invention as recited in Claims 9 and 15-20 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Markus in view of Rai, further in view of Daswani.

As described above, Markus alone, or in combination with Daswani, and the claimed invention are very different. Markus actually teaches away from the claimed limitations of the present invention by having the end computer system download forms directly from the Internet. The embodiments of the present invention populate web clippings without the end computer system downloading the web clipping, as claimed. The embodiments of the present invention as claimed do not download forms from the Internet, as taught by Markus.

Daswani also teaches away from the claimed invention by teaching the form is downloaded by the client device. The claimed limitations of the present invention teach populating the form without the handheld computer system downloading the form. As claimed, the end computer system is not directly connected to the Internet and does not download the form. Rai may teach wireless access to the public Internet (col. 2 line 36), however does not remedy the deficiencies in Markus and Daswani. Rai fails to teach or suggest “populating said selected web clipping with the retrieved personal information without said handheld computer system downloading said selected web clipping,” as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does the combination of Markus, Daswani and Rai teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 10 or 16 and that these claims are thus in a condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Markus taken in combination with Rai and further in combination with Daswani does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claim 9 which depends from independent Claim 1, Claim 15 which depends on independent Claim 10 and Claims 16-20 which depend from independent Claim 15. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 9 and 15-20 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in a condition for allowance.

#### CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the amended Claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 overcome the rejections and objections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.



Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: 11/22, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Anthony Murabito', written over a horizontal line.

Anthony Murabito  
Registration No. 35,295

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060